arXiv:cond-mat/0412091v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 5 Dec 2004

Reply to "Comment on 'Charge expulsion and electric field in superconductors' "

J. E. Hirsch
Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093-0319

(Dated: February 2, 2008)

I argue that the validity of the new electrodynamic equations for superconductors proposed in my paper can and should be decided by experiment. Furthermore I show that BCS theory is ambiguous in its prediction of screening of longitudinal electric fields and hence cannot be used to decide between the validity of my theory versus the conventional theory. I also give a physical argument for why screening of electric fields by superconducting electrons should be expected to be less efficient than that by normal electrons, as predicted by the new equations.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Mn , 74.20.De , 71.10.-w

In my recent work[1, 2], a new relation between charge density ρ and electric potential ϕ in superconductors was proposed

$$\rho(\vec{r})-\rho_0=-\frac{1}{4\pi\lambda_L^2}[\phi(\vec{r})-\phi_0(\vec{r})] \tag{1}$$

where λ_L is the London penetration depth, ρ_0 is a positive constant, and $\phi_0(\vec{r})$ is the electrostatic potential generated by charge density ρ_0. In this comment[3] it is argued that the correct relation is instead

$$\rho(\vec{r})=-\frac{1}{4\pi\lambda_{TF}^2}\phi(\vec{r}) \tag{2}$$

with λ_{TF} the Thomas Fermi screening length, and hence that Eq. (1) is incorrect.

There are two differences between Eq. (1) and Eq. (2). First, Eq. (1) together with Poisson's equation predicts the existence of an excess of negative charge within a London penetration depth of the surface of a superconductor, and an excess of positive charge (of density ρ_0) in the interior. As a consequence, a 'spontaneous' electrostatic field is predicted to exist inside superconductors and, if the sample is non-spherical, also outside[4]. Instead, Eq. (2) predicts that no charge inhomogeneity and hence no electrostatic field exists in the absence of applied external field. The validity of either of these predictions can be tested by experiment but this has not been done yet.

Second, Eq. (1) predicts that externally applied electrostatic fields will penetrate the superconductor a distance λ_L, which is typically at least two orders of magnitude larger than the normal state Thomas Fermi penetration length λ_{TF} which Eq. (2) predicts. In 1936 H. London performed an experiment which in principle should have been able to discriminate between these predictions[5], namely he attempted to measure a change in the capacitance of a capacitor with superconducting plates when it goes superconducting. He found no change, which would appear to support Eq. (2) over Eq. (1). However, I propose Eq. (1) to describe only the superfluid response, and at the temperature at which H. London's experiment was performed ($T/T_c \sim 0.4$) , it would have been masked by the normal quasiparticle response, which is of the form Eq. (2): the expected increase in the electric penetration length at that temperature (due to the decrease in the density of normal fluid carriers) is less than a factor of two of the normal metal value, far below London's experimental sensitivity which was of order $20\mathring{A}$. The experiment has never been repeated at lower temperatures, hence this second aspect of Eq. (1) also remains experimentally untested.

The comment objects to Eq. (1) on theoretical grounds. First it argues that "Eq. (1) cannot be accepted, because it is against the general understanding that the charge screening length is still given by λ_{TF} in the superconducting state". To counter this qualitative statement I give the following qualitative argument: mobile electrons in normal metals screen because they are driven by the electric field to the point where they have minimum *potential energy.* Instead for superfluid electrons *both potential and kinetic energy* play a role, and the point of minimum total energy will in general be different from that of minimum potential energy. To put it another way, when a superfluid electron moves to a region of lower potential energy it gains kinetic energy; since it cannot lose this kinetic energy by inelastic scattering as a normal electron would, it will 'overshoot' the point of minimum potential energy leaving the electric field unscreened. Thus superfluid electrons should be expected to be less efficient at screening longitudinal electric fields than normal electrons.

Second, the comment argues for the validity of Eq. (2) over Eq. (1) based on BCS theory. This assumes the validity of BCS theory to describe superconductivity, an assumption that my paper doesn't make. Contrary to the situation in 1969[6] when it was generally believed that BCS theory describes all superconductivity in solids, it is currently generally agreed that at least *some* superconductors (e.g. high T_c cuprates) are *not* described by conventional BCS theory. Hence it is not inconceivable that the electrodynamics of superconductors deduced from BCS theory may not describe the electrodynamics of real superconductors.

Furthermore, the calculation described in the comment within BCS theory that reaches the result Eq. (2) is done *within a particular gauge*, where the magnetic vector potential is set to zero. There is no a priori reason to choose that gauge over any other gauge, and in any other gauge the BCS calculation will yield a result different from Eq. (2). Related to this, an alternative way to do the calculation within BCS theory is to compute the current density $\vec{J}$ in the presence of a space- and time-dependent potential with Fourier component $\phi(\vec{q},\omega)$, which yields[7]

$$\vec{q}\cdot\vec{J}(\vec{q},\omega) = \frac{n_s e^2}{m}\frac{q^2}{\omega}\phi(\vec{q},\omega) \tag{3}$$

for small q and ω, with n_s the superfluid density. Next we extract the charge density from the continuity equation

$$\vec{\nabla}\cdot\vec{J} = -\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}, \tag{4}$$

and obtain

$$\rho = -\frac{n_s e^2}{m}\frac{q^2}{\omega^2}\phi. \tag{5}$$

Assuming that both λ_L and λ_{TF} are given by their free electron expressions

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_L^2} = \frac{4\pi n_s e^2}{mc^2} \tag{6a}$$

$$\frac{1}{\lambda_{TF}^2} = \frac{6\pi n_s e^2}{\epsilon_F} \tag{6b}$$

with ϵ_F the Fermi energy, Eq. (5) will yield my result Eq. (1) (for the particular case $\rho_0 = 0$) if the limit $(q,\omega)\rightarrow(0,0)$ is taken such that $\omega/q = c$, and will yield the result of the comment Eq. (2) if the limit is taken with $\omega/q = v_F/\sqrt{3}$, with v_F the Fermi velocity, and will yield any other result depending on how the limit is taken. This illustrates the ambiguity of the BCS approach and that *it cannot be used* to decide between the validity of Eqs. (1) and (2).

I note that Eq. (1) (for $\rho_0 = 0$) and Eq. (2) are both of the form

$$\rho(\vec{r}) = -en_s(\frac{e\phi(\vec{r})}{E_{sc}}) \tag{7}$$

which says that the fraction of superfluid density n_s that gives rise to the induced charge density is given by the ratio of the electrostatic energy to an energy scale E_{sc}. For Eq. (2) this energy scale is $E_{sc} \sim \epsilon_F$, the Fermi energy, while for Eq. (1) it is $E_{sc} = mc^2$, the rest energy of the superfluid condensate carriers. Furthermore in the classical theory of the condensed charged Bose gas[8], this energy scale is given by $E_{sc} \sim \hbar\omega_p$, with ω_p the plasma frequency. These are three different possible answers that give rise to three different screening lengths, and certainly without assuming the validity of a given microscopic theory it is not possible to decide between these answers on theoretical grounds. And even assuming the validity of BCS theory the answer is ambiguous as discussed above.

The electrodynamics that I propose is simpler than the one advocated in the comment, in that it relies on the Lorenz gauge rather than the unnatural gauge given by Eq. (6) of the comment. The dispersion relation for the longitudinal and transverse modes is identical in my theory[2], while it is very different in the theory advocated in the comment. Furthermore the electrodynamics I propose is relativistically covariant while the one in the comment is not. Thus I argue that my theory is more natural than the conventional theory advocated in the comment and for that reason more likely to be correct. Nevertheless, the validity or invalidity of it should be decided by experiment and not by theoretical prejudice. In addition to the experimental tests discussed above, measurement of the dispersion relation for longitudinal plasmon modes should be able to differentiate between both theories, but such measurement in the superconducting state has not been done to date.

---

[1] J.E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev B **68**, 184502 (2003).

[2] J.E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev B **69**, 214515 (2004).

[3] T. Koyama, cond-mat/0412090 (2004), to appear in Phys. Rev B.

[4] J.E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 016402 (2004).

[5] H. London, Proc.Roy.Soc. A**155**, 102 (1936).

[6] "Superconductivity", ed. by R. D. Parks, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1969.

[7] G. Rickayzen, “Theory of Superconductivity”, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1965, Chpt. 6.

[8] A.S. Alexandrov and W.H. Beere, Phys. Rev. B **51**, 5887 (1995).